



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington. DC 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
087300.	510 0970	2/94 GEFTER	M	092.005

18M1/0618

DARLENE A. VANSTONE IMMULOGIC PHARMACEUTICAL CORPORATION 610 LINCOLN STREET WALTHAM MA 02154 EXAMINER T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED:

06/18/97

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks'

Advisory Action

Application No.

08/300,510

Applicant(s)

Gefter et al.

Examiner

Thomas M. Cunningham

Group Art Unit 1816



ТН	E PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]
	a) [X] expires6 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
	expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.
	Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.
	Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).
	plicant's response to the final rejection, filed on <u>Jun 12, 1997</u> has been considered with the following effect, is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:
	The proposed amendment(s):
	will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
	will not be entered because:
	they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
	they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
	they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
	\square they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
	NOTE:
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons previously set forth. The 112/2 rejection is maintained as the claim language does not particularly point
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons previously set forth. The 112/2 rejection is maintained as the claim language does not particularly point out the critical "nonimmunogenic" characteristics of the peptide, e.g that the term refers to any peptide w/o adjuvant. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons previously set forth. The 112/2 rejection is maintained as the claim language does not particularly point out the critical "nonimmunogenic" characteristics of the peptide, e.g that the term refers to any peptide w/o adjuvant. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons previously set forth. The 112/2 rejection is maintained as the claim language does not particularly point out the critical "nonimmunogenic" characteristics of the peptide, e.g that the term refers to any peptide w/o adjuvant. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons previously set forth. The 112/2 rejection is maintained as the claim language does not particularly point out the critical "nonimmunogenic" characteristics of the peptide, e.g that the term refers to any peptide w/o adjuvant. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: none
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons previously set forth. The 112/2 rejection is maintained as the claim language does not particularly point out the critical "nonimmunogenic" characteristics of the peptide, e.g that the term refers to any peptide w/o adjuvant. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: none Claims objected to: none
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons previously set forth. The 112/2 rejection is maintained as the claim language does not particularly point out the critical "nonimmunogenic" characteristics of the peptide, e.g that the term refers to any peptide w/o adjuvant. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: none Claims objected to: none Claims rejected: 103-144
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons previously set forth. The 112/2 rejection is maintained as the claim language does not particularly point out the critical "nonimmunogenic" characteristics of the peptide, e.g that the term refers to any peptide w/o adjuvant. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: none Claims objected to: none Claims rejected: 103-144 The proposed drawing correction filed on has has not been approved by the Examiner.
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons previously set forth. The 112/2 rejection is maintained as the claim language does not particularly point out the critical "nonimmunogenic" characteristics of the peptide, e.g that the term refers to any peptide w/o adjuvant. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed: none Claims objected to: none Claims rejected: 103-144 The proposed drawing correction filed on has has not been approved by the Examiner. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) Other The 112/1 rejection is maintained as the claimed peptides are recognized by the immune system and thus are "immunogenic". The rejection under 35 USC 103(a) is
	Newly proposed or amended claims